

## Today's Topics:

alternative to FM transceivers?  
Callbook privacy?  
Getting serious about building.  
Morse code, obscenity, and packet retransmission.  
Re: ARRL and tx/rx mods  
rec.radio.shortwave "invite"  
The un-net on 10meters on Saturday (1600-1800Z)  
University Clubs notice  
W1AW: Computer-generated QRM ?

-----

Date: 20 Dec 89 20:31:19 GMT

From: oli-stl!asylum!langz@decwrl.dec.com (Lang Zerner)

Subject: alternative to FM transceivers?

Message-ID: <9170@asylum.SF.CA.US>

First off, I am a radio novice with a good technical background in non-electronic areas. I understand logic and the basic principles of electronics, but I couldn't build something from a schematic. I do have friends who are electronics hackers and can read schematics, but none know radio. I have a radio problem which could be solved by hacking existing equipment or locating suitable alternates. Now...

I produce live roleplaying "living fiction" weekends at a wilderness site in northern California. At the moment we are using FM headset transceivers for communication between staff. This works for the most part, since staff aren't usually too far apart, the grounds are fairly flat, and the structures are mostly wooden without thick walls or wiring. Unfortunately, there is one part of the site (the "Indian Bowl") which is up a wooded hill. The transceivers communicate (with difficulty) almost the complete distance between the Indian Bowl and the production control center, but not quite.

The transceivers are small boxes which attach to staffers' belts, with attached headsets with boom mikes. Can anyone suggest an alternative with a better range. The system must be lightweight and portable, and an earphone for private listening is essential. We would like to keep costs down and avoid red tape, so equipment which requires courses and license exams is not exactly preferable.

Alternately, I'd be interested in learning about any way to extend the range of our current equipment. The systems span a fairly wide frequency range, so increasing the FM deviation wouldn't necessarily cause a problem (we could just use the middle of the five frequencies), if that could help. If any such modifications would be in violation of FCC regulations, please let me know. Naturally, I am interested in learning about such modifications for educational

purposes only.

In case they are helpful, I've attached the transceiver specs below. Thanks!

Maxon Model 49-H5 FM Transceiver  
Specifications

General:

Power source            4 x 6VDC "AA" size batteries

Frequency range            A -- 49.830    B -- 49.845    C -- 49.860  
(5 channels)            D -- 49.875    E -- 49.890

Current Drain Stand-by:        20 mA  
                          Receive: 60 mA  
                          Transmit: 50 mA

Service range Avg.:        400 meters  
                          Max.:     800 meters

Dimensions                160mm x 72mm x 24 mm

Receiver:

Receiving system    FM dual conversion superheterodyne

Intermediate frequency First:    10.7 MHz  
                                  Second: 455 KHz

Sensitivity            1 uV (20dB quieting)  
                          1 uV (squellch open)

Spurious/image reject    20 dB min.

Frequency stability       +/- 2 KHz (0-40deg C)

Speaker impedance        32 ohm

Transmitter:

Transmitting system       Voice-activated or manual switch to begin transmit

Power                    10,000uV meter @ 3 meters (FCC Maximum)

Antenna                 50 ohm flexible whip

Modulation                FM

Max frequency deviation 4.5 KHz

Audio distortion 10% maximum

Frequency stability +/- 2 KHz (0-40deg C)

Microphone electret condenser

--

Be seeing you...

--Lang Zerner

langz@asylum.sf.ca.us UUCP:bionet!asylum!langz ARPA:langz@athena.mit.edu

"...and every morning we had to go and LICK the road clean with our TONGUES!"

-----

Date: 20 Dec 89 08:02:35 GMT

From: wa3wbu!ka3adu!dave@uunet.uu.net (dave hultberg)

Subject: Callbook privacy?

Message-ID: <580@ka3adu.UUCP>

In article <322@ssc.UUCP>, tad@ssc.UUCP (Tad Cook) writes:

>

>

> Regarding G6WBG's query, the FCC files that are used for publishing  
> the callbook are a matter of public record. I have known hams who  
> wanted a bit more privacy, so they filed a form 610 to show their  
> mailing address as a P.O. Box.

>

Using a P.O. Box is good enough to conceal your address in the Callbook, but not in the publicly available data bases. I have a copy of the US Amateur file that Rusty Carruth got from the FCC. In addition to the mailing address, it contains your station address. Station addresses must be actual physical location, not P.O. Box or rural route box number, etc. In this age of computers, true privacy is pretty rare.

--

=====

Dave Hultberg	KA3UZR	UUCP:	uunet!wa3wbu!ka3adu!compnect!daveh
US Snail:	1407 Concord Road, Mechanicsburg, PA 17055-1955	CIS:	72437,3215

-----

Date: 20 Dec 89 15:39:42 GMT

From: rochester!rit!cci632!dvh@rutgers.edu (David Hallidy)

Subject: Getting serious about building.

Message-ID: <32734@cci632.UUCP>



they deserve it) has a lot of good basic ideas you can adapt to your own application, if you don't want to copy their construction articles.

Anyway, if you want to Henry, give me a call or email me and we can discuss some RF design ideas. My daytime Phone # is (716) 482-5000 ext.2345. If not convenient, email me and we'll go from there.

Hope this is some help.

73 Dave KD5RO

-----  
Date: 20 Dec 89 23:34:10 GMT  
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!mips!excelan!unix!ginger.sri.com!  
henry@tut.cis.ohio-state.edu (Henry Pasternack)  
Subject: Morse code, obscenity, and packet retransmission.  
Message-ID: <7114@unix.SRI.COM>

My apologies to those who might have been offended by some strong language I used at the end of a recent posting. I would like to point out that I was replying to the signature offered by Michael Batchelor in which he made an off-color comment about code, encrypted in dots and dashes. The final line to my posting quoted Mr. Batchelor, and so the comment was not entirely out of the blue.

A New Jersey ham politely but firmly asked me to watch my language because a group he is associated with retransmits this bulletin board via packet radio. In my reply to him, I expressed surprise that retransmissions occur automatically without the immediate supervision of a control operator. This strikes me as somewhat illegal, since there is no means of controlling the transmission content.

Comments?

In any event, I admit it is in bad taste to publically propagate obscenity. But the computer net is not amateur radio. I wonder if some people forget that fact when they feed USENET directly into their packet systems.

-Henry

-----  
Date: 19 Dec 89 23:44:50 GMT

From: hpfcso!hpfcdc!perry@hplabs.hp.com (Perry Scott)  
Subject: Re: ARRL and tx/rx mods  
Message-ID: <7880101@hpfcdc.HP.COM>

I recant. I said Marine VHF, and what you say is true. That band requires type acceptance.

However, CAP other para-military frequencies are well within the capabilities of most 2-meter rigs. I've been told that most military bands do not need the type acceptance.

Funny how the government treats itself and commercial interests differently.

Perry Scott  
KF0CA

-----  
Date: 20 Dec 89 13:36:26 GMT  
From: shlump.nac.dec.com!ryn.esg.dec.com!pstjtt.enet.dec.com!taber@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: rec.radio.shortwave "invite"  
Message-ID: <629@ryn.esg.dec.com>

In article <270@ccop1.ocpt.ccur.com>, wilson@ccop1.ocpt.ccur.com (<wilson>) writes...

>

>

>Can anybody explain what a "dweeb" is? It's not listed in my  
>American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language.  
>Although I can infer a definition from the context in  
>which it's used, I prefer to have a precise definition.

>

DWEEB -- Noun, but not a person or place, if you get my drift.

An entity which has a compulsive need for precise, authorized definitions. Someone who needs the joke explained. Several times. The person in the audience who shouts "That slide is upside down!" as if they were the only who could see it. Armchair lawyers who argue that transmitting a fax of sheet music is transmitting music. The person who required that auto mirrors have the words "Objects are closer than they appear" written on them. People who object to Bugs Bunny cartoons because they promote violence. People unable to think for themselves and unwilling to let others think either. A generic class of individuals who don't have a clue that they don't have a clue.

Useage is generally considered somewhat pejorative.

>>>==>PStJTT  
Patrick St. Joseph Teahan Taber

Mail address: Nahhhhh, you don't want to send me mail....

-----  
Date: 19 Dec 89 23:22:27 GMT  
From: hpfcso!hpfcdc!perry@hplabs.hp.com (Perry Scott)  
Subject: The un-net on 10meters on Saturday (1600-1800Z)  
Message-ID: <7880100@hpfcdc.HP.COM>

>>I do wish that contest organizers would set up band restrictions. 29.300  
>>through 29.600 was completely full. I had to go all the way up to 29.650  
>>to find an un-contested frequency.  
>  
>I hope you mean 28.300 - 28.600.

Yup. Got lost. Thought CB was 28 MHz.

I think it would be sufficient for contest organizers to reserve the  
lower 25 KHz of the Novice 10m band for the rest of us. Same for the  
lower part of the General 15 and 20 bands.

I still stand by my statement that contests are insta-QRM generators.  
The real problem is that all nets get displaced by testers, while the  
reverse is not true. I think the band is big enough for all uses -  
contests, nets, and ragchewers. Do we need to talk to CQ, QST, et.al. ?

Perry

-----  
Date: 20 Dec 89 21:20:16 GMT  
From: rochester!rit!ultb!cep4478@rutgers.edu (C.E. Piggott)  
Subject: University Clubs notice  
Message-ID: <1809@ultb.isc.rit.edu>

I have the following people on my list ... I don't think that I  
really lost anybody - if you're missing, we'll fix it ASAP.  
If you missed what's going on here, I'm compiling a list of  
people involved with university amateur radio clubs, to exchange  
ideas etc. with each other.

I'll ask Phil to post something to here about how to add yourself to

the list...I know how to do it from bitnet, but not from internet.

Write me email to cep4478@ulthb.isc.rit.edu if you wrote me and I missed you - I'll be writing personally to everyone probably right after the new year.

--

worall@freezer.it.udel.edu R.Todd Worall KB2GGS U. of Delaware ARC  
kawai@csl.stanford.edu Goh Kawai N6UOK - Stanford ARC  
paulf@shasta.stanford.edu Paul Flaherty, N9FZX - Stanford ARC  
huopio@kannel.lut.fi Kauto Huopio, Lappeenranta U. of Technology  
snowdog@athena.mit.edu Rich Brezina, N1FMM - M.I.T. ARC  
bjb@hubcap.clemson.edu BJ Backitis KM4RB - Clemson U. ARC  
luigi@mts.rpi.edu Luigi Giasi, R.P.I. ARC (W2SZ)  
msmith@topaz.rutgers.edu Mark Smith, Rutgers ARC  
mcdonald@topaz.rutgers.edu Dan McDonald, KB2EEP - Rutgers ARC  
cousens@hardees.rutgers.edu Scott Cousens N3FXP - Rutgers ARC  
rsanders@sunee.UWaterloo.edu Roger Sanderson VE3RKS - U. of Waterloo  
levine@clutx.clarkson.edu Steve Levine NK1W - Clarkson U. ARC  
cromwell@ef.ecn.purdue.edu Bob Cromwell W9YB - Purdue ARC  
deplo@eniac.seas.upenn.edu Jeff Deplo N3HZB - U of Pennsylvania ARC  
dunc@godzilla.eecg.toronto.edu Duncan VE3PKD, U of Toronto  
mark@ab1x.enet.dec.com Mark Hald, N1EEM - Northeastern U. ARC

-----  
Date: 20 Dec 89 00:07:07 GMT  
From: hpfcso!hpfcdc!perry@hplabs.hp.com (Perry Scott)  
Subject: W1AW: Computer-generated QRM ?  
Message-ID: <7880102@hpfcdc.HP.COM>

This is probably a re-hashed question that comes up every two years - I thought W1AW was just like the rest of us, and aren't allowed to QRM a frequency. If the transmitter is computer controlled, isn't this slightly un-nice to anyone they happen to land on ?

A few nights ago, four hams on 7.290 were ragchewing late into the night. It was particularly interesting because one was in Buffalo, NY, and another was in Honolulu. The copy wasn't particularly good; the band QSB was pretty bad. However, it was fun to see if Buffalo could make it to KH6.

Lo and behold, W1AW comes on with it's bulletin/broadcast. The weird part was that nobody really heard W1AW, except the guy in Buffalo. I was really surprised to hear him say that my speech processor and lowly 300 watts PEP could go up against W1AW anytime. I listened for a moment before replying, and sonofagun, there it was !

I want to share the band with everyone, but it appears some stations are



more equal than others. Had a real operator at W1AW come on and asked for the frequency, citing schedules, tradition, whatever, I'm sure we could have moved. It's just that 7.290 is a nice frequency - no foreign broadcast station.

I think the W1AW operating policy is rude at the least. While nets have their place, we all operate according to Gentlemen's Agreement. Computer-controlled QRM is about as bad as Computer-controlled telephone solicitors.

Perry Scott  
KF0CA

-----

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #1048  
\*\*\*\*\*